



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,833	04/13/2007	Maxime Buffat	8845/97585	8544
24628 7590 12/10/2008 Husch Blackwell Sanders, LLP Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP Welsh & Katz 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
RAHMANI, NILOOFAR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/10/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/581,833

**Applicant(s)**

BUFFAT ET AL.

**Examiner**

NILOOFAR RAHMANI

**Art Unit**

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are currently pending in the instant application.

#### ***Priority***

2. This application was filed on 04/13/2007, and is a 371 of PCT/GB04/05096, filed on 12/06/2004, and claims priority of UNITED KINGDOM 0328295.1, filed on 12/05/2003.

3. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. V. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966). These claims are withdrawn from consideration.

4. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 13-15 provide for the use of compounds as claimed in any of the claim 1, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

**5. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for agonist acetylcholine or muscarinic receptor, does not reasonably provide enablement for treat and prevent any and all diseases mediated by this receptor. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is “undue”. These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the

inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

- 1) The breadth of the claims.
- 2) The nature of the invention,
- 3) The state of the prior art,
- 4) The level of one of ordinary skill,
- 5) The level of predictability in the art,
- 6) The amount of direction provided by the inventor,
- 7) The existence of working examples,
- 8) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

**The nature of the invention:** The instant invention is drawn to method of treatment, prophylaxis and/or inhibition of disorders caused by the malfunction of the acetylcholine or muscarinic systems comprising the administration of a therapeutically effective amount of a compound as claimed in claim 1.

**The state of the prior art:** “ At the time that the invention was made, the scientific literature tends to show the speculative role of the acetylcholine receptor and its role in the treatment of disorder. “Since medial-temporal lobe injury is a frequent contributor to memory dysfunction in TBI, it is likely that an acetylcholine deficit contributes to memory dysfunction in this population. Recently, Donepezil, an acetylcholine-esterase inhibitor which has demonstrated a high selectivity for neural Ach-esterase (with minimal side effects), was approved for use in dementia in Alzheimer's patients. Should these initial

results be supported in larger trials, Donepezil may prove to be a valuable tool for the treatment of memory dysfunction in TBI." (Emphasis added). ( Taverni et al., Brain injury: [BI], (1998 Jan) Vol. 12, No. 1, pages 77-80.)

**The predictability in the art:** It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instantly claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to the therapeutic effects, whether or not the compounds of formula of claim 1 would be useful for treating a pharmacological condition in a subject.

**Amount of guidance/working examples:** Applicant provides examples of the compound of example 1 to agonist muscarinic receptor on pages 34-36. However, There is no guidance for using a therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) could treat any and all muscarinic related disease. Nor does applicant identify what diseases are treatable by therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I).

**The breadth of the claims:** The breadth of claims is drawn to method of treatment, prophylaxis and/or inhibition of disorders caused by the malfunction of the acetylcholine or muscarinic systems comprising the administration of a therapeutically effective amount of a compound as claimed in claim 1.

**The quantity of undue experimentation needed:** Since the guidance and teaching provided by the specification is insufficient for treating diseases associated with therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) is efficacious, one of ordinary skill in the art, even with high level of skill, is unable to use the instant compounds as claimed without undue experimentation.

**The level of the skill in the art:** The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Taking all of the above into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim 16, for treating diseases associated with therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) is efficacious, have been enabled by the instant specification.

6. Further, applicants are not enabled for preventing any of these diseases. The only established prophylactics are vaccines not the compounds such as present here. In addition, it is presumed that "prevention" of the claimed diseases would require a method of identifying those individuals who will develop the claimed diseases before they exhibit symptoms. There is no evidence of record that would guide the skilled clinician to identify those who have the potential of becoming afflicted.

"The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. 1) As discussed above, preventing diseases requires identifying those patients who will acquire the disease before occurs. This would require extensive and potentially opened ended clinical research on healthy subjects. 2) The passage spanning line 31, page 39 to line 32, page 40 lists the diseases Applicant intend to treat. 3) There is no working example of such a preventive procedure in man or animal in the specification. 4) The claims rejected are drawn to medical treatment and are therefore physiological in nature. 5) The state of the art is that no general procedure is art-recognized for determining which patients generally will become afflicted before the fact. 6) The artisan using Applicants invention would be a Board Certified physician who specialized to treat diseases with an MD degree and several years of experience. Despite intensive efforts, pharmaceutical science has been unable to find a way of getting a compound to be effective for the prevention of disorder diseases generally. Under such circumstances, it is proper for the PTO to require evidence that such an unprecedented feat has actually been accomplished, *In re Ferens*, 163 USPQ 609. No such evidence has been presented in this case.



The failure of skilled scientists to achieve a goal is substantial evidence that achieving such a goal is beyond the skill of practitioners in that art, *Genentech vs. Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1006. This establishes that it is not reasonable to any agent to be able to prevent disorders generally. That is, the skill is so low that no compound effective generally against disorders has ever been found let alone one that can prevent such conditions. 7) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). 8) The claims broadly read on all patients, not just those undergoing therapy for the claimed diseases and on the multitude of compounds embraced by Formula (I).

The Examiner suggests deletion of the word "prevention".

**7. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.


Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen et al., Chemistry--A European Journal (2002), 8(5), 1218-1226.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Jensen et al. disclosed analogous compounds, which from the STN search is

RN 443649-05-6

CN Oxazolo[4,5-c]pyridin-2(3H)-one, hexahydro-7-(hydroxymethyl)-, (3aR,7R,7aR)-rel-



RN 443649-06-7

CN Oxazolo[4,5-c]pyridin-2(3H)-one, hexahydro-7-(hydroxymethyl)-, (3aR,7S,7aS)-rel-



where in R<sup>5</sup> is -CH<sub>2</sub>-O-R<sub>7</sub>, where R<sub>7</sub> is H.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP §2141.02)

The difference between the instant claim and the prior art compound is that the instant claim replaces one H of the prior art compound with a methyl.

Finding of prima facie obviousness-rational and motivation (MPEP §2142.2143)

One having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the compounds of Jensen et al. to obtain the instant claimed compounds.

A compound that differs only in molecular arrangement from the compounds disclosed in the prior art and which for which no unexpected properties of this compound are disclosed in the specification is unpatenable, *Ex parte KRUEGER AND HAYES*, 121 USPQ 420, *In re NORRIS*, 84 USPQ 458, *In re Hass* 60 USPQ 552, which found a *prima facie* case of obviousness of 1-chloro-1-nitrobutane over 1-chloro-1-nitroisobutane taught in the prior art, *Ex parte Ulliot*, 103 USPQ 185, which found a *prima facie* case of obviousness of 2-oxo-quinolines over a 1-oxo-isoquinoline taught in the prior art, *In re FINLEY*, 81 USPQ 383, which found a *prima facie* case of obviousness of 2-ethyl hexyl salicylate over octyl salicylate taught in the prior art.

Compounds that differ only by the presence or absence of an extra methylene group or two are homologues. Homologues are of such close structural similarity that the disclosure of a compound renders *prima facie* obvious its homologues. The homologue is expected to be prepared by the same method and to have generally the same properties. This expectation is then deemed the motivation for preparing homologues. Of course, these presumptions are rebuttable by the showing of unexpected effects, but initially, the homologues are obvious even in the absence of a specific teaching to add or remove methylene groups. See *In re Wood*, 199 USPQ 137; *In re Hoke*, 195

USPQ 148, *In re Lohr*, 137 USPQ 548; *In re Magerlein*, 202 USPQ 473; *In re Wiechert*, 152 USPQ 249; *Ex parte Henkel*, 130 USPQ 474; *In re Fauque*, 121 USPQ; *In re Druey*, 138 USPQ 39.


8. Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lohse et al., Perkin 1 (2000), (5), 659-665.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Lohse et al. disclosed analogous compounds, which from the STN search is

RN 268729-90-4

CN Oxazolo[4,5-c]pyridin-2(3H)-one, hexahydro-7-(hydroxymethyl)-



, and

RN 268729-92-6

CN Oxazolo[4,5-c]pyridin-2(3H)-one, hexahydro-7-(hydroxymethyl)-



, where in R<sup>5</sup> is -CH<sub>2</sub>-O-R<sub>7</sub>, where R<sub>7</sub> is H.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP §2141.02)

The difference between the instant claim and the prior art compound is that the instant claim replaces one H of the prior art compound with a methyl.

Finding of prima facie obviousness-rational and motivation (MPEP §2142.2143)

One having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the compounds of Lohse et al. to obtain the instant claimed compounds.

A compound that differs only in molecular arrangement from the compounds disclosed in the prior art and which for which no unexpected properties of this compound are disclosed in the specification is unpatentable, *Ex parte KRUEGER AND HAYES*, 121 USPQ 420, *In re NORRIS*, 84 USPQ 458, *In re Hass* 60 USPQ 552, which found a *prima facie* case of obviousness of 1-chloro-1-nitrobutane over 1-chloro-1-nitroisobutane taught in the prior art, *Ex parte Ulliyot*, 103 USPQ 185, which found a *prima facie* case of obviousness of 2-oxo-quinolines over a 1-oxo-isoquinoline taught in the prior art, *In re FINLEY*, 81 USPQ 383 , which found a *prima facie* case of obviousness of 2-ethyl hexyl salicylate over octyl salicylate taught in the prior art.

Compounds that differ only by the presence or absence of an extra methylene group or two are homologues. Homologues are of such close structural similarity that the disclosure of a compound renders *prima facie* obvious its homologues. The homologue is expected to be prepared by the same method and to have generally the same properties. This expectation is then deemed the motivation for preparing homologues. Of course, these presumptions are rebuttable by the showing of unexpected effects, but initially, the homologues are obvious even in the absence of a specific teaching to add or remove methylene groups. See *In re Wood*, 199 USPQ 137; *In re Hoke*, 195 USPQ 148, *In re Lohr*, 137 USPQ 548; *In re Magerlein*, 202 USPQ 473; *In re*

*Wiechert*, 152 USPQ 249; *Ex parte Henkel*, 130 USPQ 474; *In re Fauque*, 121 USPQ; *In re Druey*, 138 USPQ 39.

**9. Claim Objections**

Claims 2-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a cancelled base claim 1, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

**10.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niloofar Rahmani whose telephone number is 571-272-4329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).  
/NILOOFAR RAHMANI/

12/03/2008

/D. Margaret Seaman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

Application/Control Number: 10/581,833  
Art Unit: 1625

Page 14